

REMARKS

Claims 1-80 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 24, 35, 42, 45, 62, 66, 67-69, 74, and 78-81 have been amended. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and in other applications.

The Abstract stands objected to due to informalities. The Abstract has been amended to correct the informalities identified by the Office Action. The Abstract has also been amended to correct an obvious typographical error (changing “Oaring” to “Oring”). No new matter has been added. Therefore the objection to the abstract should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8, 50, 62-65, and 74-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuddes (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,920) (“Kuddes”). Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a memory refresh circuit comprising “a control circuit for conducting a memory refresh operation and for indicating when said refresh operation is complete.”

Kuddes discloses a refresh control system and method for refreshing DRAM memory in a data processing system. (Kuddes, Abstract)

Kuddes’ refresh circuit has static, time-dependant refresh operations, as suggested by the written description of Kuddes’ patent, (see, for example, col. 8, line 13 – col. 10, line 31) whereas the memory refresh circuitry of the claimed invention uses a dynamic indicator, e.g., a refresh complete signal, to perform refresh operations. (Specification, ¶ [0012]). Therefore, the “refresh circuit” of Kuddes is different from the refresh circuit of the claimed invention. Thus, for at least this reason the rejection to claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

Claims 5-8, 50, 62-65, and 74-77 are similar to claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

Claims 45-49, 69-73, and 81-85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ware et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,446,696) (“Ware”). Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 45 recites, inter alia, a memory device comprising “refresh circuitry for controlling a refresh operation in a memory device; and a sensor for sensing an environmental condition of the memory device; wherein said refresh circuitry is adapted to initiate the refresh operation partially in response to the environmental condition sensed by the sensor, said refresh circuitry adapted to indicate when said refresh operation is complete.”

Ware discloses a “synchronous DRAM system with internal refresh [that] is controlled by a refresh signal issued by an oscillator or memory controller coupled to the DRAM.” (Ware, Abstract).

Ware fails to disclose or suggest “said refresh circuitry adapted to indicate when said refresh operation is complete.” Therefore for at least this reason, the rejection to claim 45 should be withdrawn.

Claims 46-49 depend from claim 45 and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

Claims 69-73 and 81-85 are similar to claim 45 and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

Claims 9-11, 51-60, 66-68 and 78-80 stand objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-11, 51-60, 66-68 and 78-80 are allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability of claims 12-44 and 61.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant